

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated September 28, 2010 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 4, 6, and 10 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 2-3, 7, and 9 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claim 7 has been amended to improve antecedent support for the element “third motor” recited in this claim. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

As will be discussed below, it is requested that all of claims 2-3, 5, and 7-9 be found allowable as reciting patentable subject matter.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112:**

In the Office Action, claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness.

In response, claim 9 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Claim 10 has been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the § 112, second paragraph rejections to the claims be withdrawn.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:**

Claims 1-2, 4, 6, and 9-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,797,900 of Madhani *et al.* (“Madhani”).

Claims 1, 4, 6, and 10 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is rendered moot. Claims 2 and 9 depend from allowed claim 5. Thus, the prior art rejection under §102 over Madhani is considered moot.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:**

Claims 3 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable as obvious over Madhani and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,732,599 of Iriyama (“Iriyama”).

Claim 8 depends from claim 3. Claim 3 has been amended to depend from allowed claim 5. Thus, because claims 3 and 8 depend from an allowed claim, the prior art rejection of claims 3 and 8 under §103 over Madhani in view of Iriyama is considered moot.

**CONCLUSION:**

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention recites subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited prior art.

Applicants further submit that the subject matter is more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unobvious to a person of skill in the art. Applicants therefore respectfully request that each of claims 2-3 and 8-9 be found allowable and, along with allowed claims 5 and 7, this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time.

Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alicia M. Choi/

---

Alicia M. Choi  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 46,621

**Customer No. 32294**  
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.  
14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802

AMC:dk